



# City of Tempe

MINUTES FOR THE STAFF ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
(SAC) MEETING

1:30-3:30 pm, February 21, 2002  
Development Services Conference Room

## **ATTENDANCE:**

Roger Austin, Police  
Bill Kersbergen, Design Review  
Cliff Mattice, City Attorney  
Jim Bond, Engineering  
Mary O'Connor, PW, Transit  
Mandi Roberts, Otak  
Roger Millar, Otak  
Bonnie Richardson, CD+D  
Grace Kelly, Planning  
Randy White, Planning

Rob Conway, Transportation  
Steve Venker, Development Services  
Chris Messer, CD+D  
Jan Koehn, Code Compliance  
Jim Peterson, Planning  
Scot Siegel, Otak  
Fred Brittingham, Planning  
Ryan Levesque, CD+D  
Arlene Palisoc, Planning  
Gary Davis, Transit

## **• INTRODUCTION**

- Overview of Module II rough draft.
- After the neighborhood meeting last night, Fred and Otak have decided to add two to four new people to the Citizen Advisory Committee. There was a strong desire by some of the residents to be included in our rough draft phase. Selection process has yet to be determined.
- The ordinance rewrite draft is now about 60% of the way through. A complete draft will be available in April. Afterwards, case studies will be used to see if the zoning ordinance works.
- Otak wants to know from staff when the Community Design Standards apply to a project, with regards to processing.
- There is text in the document which calls out for "recommendations" or "encouragement". We need to be clear that the ordinance establishes requirements and any deviation from that would go through a variance process.
- The sign ordinance section is still very preliminary and will be available in Module III.
- (Mandy, Otak) A copy of the draft Pedestrian Overlay District and diagram was handed out.
- You will notice that items that were intended to be in the new overlay district are also in the base code. It is still undecided if pedestrian design sections will remain in either one or both the zoning ordinance and overlay.
- The overlay district will have regulations rather than guidelines. (i.e. shall)

- Portland has a lot of neighborhood plans. If you're in an area, then those plans will be addressed through the design review process. Guidelines state, "A building should ..."
- We might be looking at limiting a 120% max. on parking requirements. How does this apply to either the base code or overlay districts? Staff to provide comments.
- A week had been spent on each corridor, with public feedback and analysis.
- A question to staff will be, does the pedestrian guidelines/standards go to the base code or overlay?
- Staff, are there any opportunities with local cities in their cutting edge ideas? For example Phoenix and its parking garages with first floor retail. Chandler/Mesa had done some work on pedestrian overlays as well.
- CPTED plan requires a security plan for Adult-Oriented businesses. This should be incorporated in the adult description.
- Definitions for Use tables (P, S, U) should be placed at the beginning of each table.
- The allowed uses that are permitted in lower districts (industrial districts etc.), by default are permitted in higher districts.
- March 7<sup>th</sup> is the deadline for comments on Module II. Send them to Arlene or Grace.
- Special uses will be identified in the next module.
- Security Plans for bars, adult uses, usually are picked up through a use permit process. (Should be in procedures)
- An artist opportunity is mentioned in the Pedestrian Overlay District.
- 3-101 Permitted Uses, moving a driveway does not require a review, but they still need to come into the department.
- The applicability of base code regulations is essential to ensure conformance of an approval.
- A one umbrella statement for when base codes apply is needed for some or all chapters. This would prevent any confusion to whether a building addition, parking lot improvements, TI, etc., would require conformance to the ordinance.
- Community Design Standards: Are they requirements, guidelines or both? We need to understand the applicability. For example, using the wording "shall comply" would explain a code requirement.
- Section 3-203 is essentially the Subdivision Ordinance. Any deviation from our current Sub. Ordinance requires council approval. Does this same process apply in this section?
- CPTED: Existing alleys in Tempe are a problem for crime prevention. If future alleys are proposed, consider more visible designs.
- Subdivision procedures, make it clear who is judging a subdivision change/waiver?

- Variances are state statute regulations.
- Fred Brittingham's impression of the ordinance was to integrate engineering standards, subdivision, transit standards, into the appendices.
- Including the ADA parking requirements in the ordinance is very helpful, without having to refer to another document. Again, something to consider, would someone be able to request a variance since the ADA requirements are in the code?
- Deviation process, how would it work vs. a variance process.
- The variance process is still a good safety valve.
- First we need to understand what the historical path for code provisions, then what can we do to make the adjustments work within our code or not.
- In the ordinance rewrite, we are encouraging access through alley or path. Instead of dedicated alleys, we should consider shifting landscape next to the residence as a buffer to the single family residence. To consider an alley to be safe by CPTED standards you need a 42 foot corridor.
- When reviewing this document look for the (shalls, must, can't) and identify if it is appropriate.
- When reviewing the rewrite code identify sections in your comments rather than page numbers.
- Included in the review is the Pedestrian Overlay District. Comments due by March 7<sup>th</sup> and turned into Grace Kelly or Arlene Palisoc.